arXiv:1408.1234v2 [math.ST] 19 Oct 2015

Bayesian Model Averaging with Exponentiated Least Squares Loss

Dong Dai
IMS Health, PA, USA

Ting Yang
Rutgers University, NJ, USA

Tong Zhang
Baidu Inc, Beijing, China & Rutgers University, NJ, USA

Abstract

The model averaging problem is to average multiple models to achieve a prediction accuracy not much worse than that of the best single model in terms of mean squared error. It is known that if the models are misspecified, model averaging is superior to model selection. Specifically, let n be the sample size, then the worst case regret of the former decays at a rate of $O(1/n)$ while the worst case regret of the latter decays at a rate of $O(1/\sqrt{n})$. The recently proposed Q-aggregation algorithm (Dai et al., 2012) solves the model averaging problem with the optimal regret of $O(1/n)$ both in expectation and in deviation; however it suffers from two limitations: (1) for continuous dictionary, the proposed greedy algorithm for solving Q-aggregation is not applicable; (2) the formulation of Q-aggregation appears ad hoc without clear intuition. This paper examines a different approach to model averaging by considering a Bayes estimator for deviation optimal model averaging by using exponentiated least squares loss. We establish a primal-dual relationship of this estimator and that of Q-aggregation and propose new greedy procedures that satisfactorily resolve the above mentioned limitations of Q-aggregation.

1 Introduction

This paper considers the model averaging problem, where the goal is to average multiple models in order to achieve improved prediction accuracy.

Let $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ be n given design points in a space $\mathcal{X}$, let $\mathcal{H} = \{f_1, \ldots, f_M\}$ be a given dictionary of real valued functions on $\mathcal{X}$ and denote $\mathsf{f}_j = (f_j(x_1), \ldots, f_j(x_n))^\top \in \mathbb{R}^n$ for each j. The goal is to estimate an unknown regression function $\eta : \mathcal{X} \to \mathbb{R}$ at the design points based on observations

$$y_i = \eta(x_i) + \xi_i \,,$$

where $\xi_1, \ldots, \xi_n$ are i.i.d $\mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$.

The performance of an estimator $\hat{\eta}$ is measured by its mean squared error (MSE) defined by

$$\mathrm{MSE}(\hat{\eta}) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} (\hat{\eta}(x_i) - \eta(x_i))^2 \,.$$

We want to find an estimator $\hat{\eta}$ that mimics the function in the dictionary with the smallest MSE. Formally, a good estimator $\hat{\eta}$ should satisfy the following *exact oracle inequality* in a certain probabilistic sense:

$$\mathrm{MSE}(\hat{\eta}) \leq \min_{j=1,\ldots,M} \mathrm{MSE}(f_j) + \Delta(n, M, \sigma^2) \,, \tag{1}$$

where the remainder term $\Delta > 0$ should be as small as possible.

The problem of model averaging has been well-studied, and it is known (see, e.g., Tsybakov, 2003; Rigollet, 2012) that the smallest possible order for $\Delta(n, M, \sigma^2)$ is $\sigma^2 \log M/n$ for oracle inequalities in expectation, where "smallest possible" is understood in the following minimax sense. There exists a dictionary $\mathcal{H} = \{f_1, \ldots, f_M\}$ such that the following lower bound holds. For any estimator $\hat{\eta}$, there exists a regression function η such that

$$\mathbb{E}\,\mathrm{MSE}(\hat{\eta}) \geq \min_{j=1,\ldots,M} \mathrm{MSE}(f_j) + C\sigma^2 \frac{\log M}{n}$$

for some positive constant C. It also implies that the lower bound holds not only in expectation but also with positive probability.

Although our goal is to achieve an MSE as close as that of the best model in $\mathcal{H}$, it is known (see Rigollet and Tsybakov, 2012, Theorem 2.1) that there exists a dictionary $\mathcal{H}$ such that any estimator $\hat{\eta}$ taking values restricted to the elements of $\mathcal{H}$ (such an estimator is referred to as a *model selection estimator*) cannot achieve an oracle inequality of form (1) with a remainder term of order smaller than $\sigma\sqrt{(\log M)/n}$; in other words, model selection is suboptimal for the purpose of competing with the best single model from a given family.

Instead of *model selection*, we can employ *model averaging* to derive oracle inequalities of form (1) that achieves the optimal regret in expectation (see the references in Rigollet and Tsybakov, 2012). More recently, several work has produced optimal oracle inequalities for model averaging that not only hold in expectation but also in deviation (Audibert, 2008; Lecué and Mendelson, 2009; Gaïffas and Lecué, 2011; Dai and Zhang, 2011; Rigollet, 2012; Dai et al., 2012). In particular, the current work is closely related to the Q-aggregation estimator investigated in (Dai et al., 2012) which solves the optimal model averaging problem both in expectation and in deviation with a remainder term $\Delta(n, M, \sigma^2)$ of order $O(1/n)$; the authors also proposed a greedy algorithm GMA-0 for Q-aggregation which improves the Greedy Model Averaging (GMA) algorithm firstly proposed by Dai and Zhang (2011). Yet there are still two limitations of Q-aggregation: (1) Q-aggregation can be generalized for continuous candidates dictionary $\mathcal{H}$, but the greedy model averaging method GMA-0 can not be applied in such setting; (2) Q-aggregation can be regarded intuitively as regression with variance penalty, but it lacks a good decision theoretical interpretation.

In this paper we introduce a novel method called *Bayesian Model Averaging with Exponentiated Least Squares Loss* (BMAX). We note that the previously studied exponential weighted model aggregation estimator EWMA (e.g. Rigollet and Tsybakov, 2012) is the Bayes estimator under the least squares loss (posterior mean), which leads to optimal regret in expectation but is suboptimal in deviation. In contrast, the new BMAX model averaging estimator is essentially a Bayes estimator under an appropriately defined *exponentiated least squares loss*, and we will show that the Q-aggregation formulation (with Kullback-Leibler entropy) in Dai et al. (2012) is essentially a dual representation of the newly introduced BMAX formulation, and it directly implies the optimality of the aggregate by BMAX. Computationally, the new model aggregation method BMAX can be approximately solved by a greedy model averaging algorithm that is applicable to continuous candidates dictionary. In summary, this paper establishes a natural Bayesian interpretation of Q-aggregation, and provides additional computational procedure that is applicable for the continuous dictionary setting. This relationship provides deeper understanding for modeling averaging procedures, and resolves the above mentioned limitations of the Q-aggregation scheme.

2 Notations

This section introduces some notations used in this paper. In the following, we denote by $\boldsymbol{Y} = (y_1, \ldots, y_n)^\top$ the observation vector, $\boldsymbol{\eta} = (\eta(x_1), \ldots, \eta(x_n))^\top$ the model output, and $\boldsymbol{\xi} = (\xi_1, \ldots, \xi_n)^\top$ the noise vector. The underlying statistical model can be expressed as

$$\boldsymbol{Y} = \boldsymbol{\eta} + \boldsymbol{\xi} \,, \tag{2}$$

with $\boldsymbol{\xi} \sim N(0, \sigma^2 \boldsymbol{I}_n)$. We also denote ℓ_2 norm as $\|\boldsymbol{Y}\|_2 = (\sum_{i=1}^n y_i^2)^{1/2}$, and the inner product as $\langle \boldsymbol{\xi}, \mathsf{f} \rangle_2 = \boldsymbol{\xi}^\top \mathsf{f}$.

Let Λ^M be the flat simplex in $\mathbb{R}^M$ defined by

$$\Lambda^M = \left\{ \boldsymbol{\lambda} = (\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_M)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^M : \lambda_j \geq 0, \sum_{j=1}^M \lambda_j = 1 \right\} \,,$$

and $\boldsymbol{\pi} = (\pi_1, \ldots, \pi_M)^\top \in \Lambda^M$ be a given prior.

Each $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \in \Lambda^M$ yields a model averaging estimator as $f_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} = \sum_{j=1}^M \lambda_j f_j$; that is, using the vector notation $\mathsf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} = (f_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}(x_1), \ldots, f_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}(x_n))^\top$ we have $\mathsf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} = \sum_{j=1}^M \lambda_j \mathsf{f}_j$.

The Kullback-Leibler divergence for $\boldsymbol{\lambda}, \boldsymbol{\pi} \in \Lambda^M$ is defined as

$$\mathcal{K}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}, \boldsymbol{\pi}) = \sum_{j=1}^M \lambda_j \log(\lambda_j / \pi_j) \,,$$

and in the definition we use the convention $0 \cdot \log(0) = 0$.

For matrix $A, B \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, $A \geq B$ is equivalent to $A - B$ is positive semi-definite.

3 Bayesian Model Averaging with Exponentiated Least Squares Loss

The traditional Bayesian model averaging estimator is the exponential weighted model averaging estimator EWMA (Rigollet and Tsybakov, 2012) which optimizes the least squares loss. Although the estimator is optimal in expectation, it is suboptimal in deviation (Dai et al., 2012). In this section we introduce a different Bayesian model averaging estimator called BMAX that optimizes an exponentiated least squares loss.

In order to introduce the BMAX estimator, we consider the following Bayesian framework, where we should be noted that the assumptions below are only used to derive BMAX, and these assumptions are not used in our theoretical analysis. $\boldsymbol{Y}$ is a normally distributed observation vector with mean $\boldsymbol{\mu} = (\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_M)^\top$ and covariance matrix $\omega^2 \boldsymbol{I}_n$:

$$\boldsymbol{Y} | \boldsymbol{\mu} \sim N(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \omega^2 \boldsymbol{I}_n) \,, \tag{3}$$

and for $j = 1, \ldots, M$, the prior for each model f_j is

$$\pi(\boldsymbol{\mu} = \mathsf{f}_j) = \pi_j \,. \tag{4}$$

In this setting, the posterior distribution of $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ given $\boldsymbol{Y}$ is

$$p(\boldsymbol{\mu} = \mathsf{f}_j | \boldsymbol{Y}) = \frac{p(\boldsymbol{Y} | \boldsymbol{\mu} = \mathsf{f}_j) p(\boldsymbol{\mu} = \mathsf{f}_j)}{\sum_{j=1}^M p(\boldsymbol{Y} | \boldsymbol{\mu} = \mathsf{f}_j) p(\boldsymbol{\mu} = \mathsf{f}_j)} = \frac{\exp\left(-\frac{\|\mathsf{f}_j - \boldsymbol{Y}\|_2^2}{2\omega^2}\right) \pi_j}{\sum_{j=1}^M \exp\left(-\frac{\|\mathsf{f}_j - \boldsymbol{Y}\|_2^2}{2\omega^2}\right) \pi_j}.$$

In the Bayesian decision theoretical framework considered in this paper, the quantity of interest is $\boldsymbol{\eta} = \mathbb{E}\boldsymbol{Y}$, and we consider a loss function $L(\boldsymbol{\psi}, \boldsymbol{\mu})$ which we would like to minimize with respect to the posterior distribution. The corresponding Bayes estimator $\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}$ minimizes the posterior expected loss from $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ as follows:

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}} = \underset{\boldsymbol{\psi} \in \mathbb{R}^n}{\operatorname{argmin}} \, \mathbb{E}\left[L(\boldsymbol{\psi}, \boldsymbol{\mu}) | \boldsymbol{Y} \right] \ . \tag{5}$$

It is worth pointing out that the above Bayesian framework is only used to obtain decision theoretically motivated model averaging estimators (Bayesian estimators have good theoretical properties such as admissibility, etc). In particular we do not assume that the model itself is correctly specified. That is, in this paper we allow misspecified models, where the parameters $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ and ω^2 are not necessarily equal to the true mean $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ and the true variance σ^2 in (2), and $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ does not necessarily belong to the dictionary $\{\mathsf{f}_1, \ldots, \mathsf{f}_M\}$.

The Bayesian estimator of (5) depends on the underlying loss function $L(\cdot, \cdot)$. For example, under the standard least squares loss $L(\boldsymbol{\psi}, \boldsymbol{\mu}) = \|\boldsymbol{\psi} - \boldsymbol{\mu}\|_2^2$, the Bayes estimator is the posterior mean, which leads to the Exponential Weighted Model Aggregation (EWMA) estimator (Rigollet and Tsybakov, 2012) :

$$\boldsymbol{\psi}_{\ell_2}(\omega^2) = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^M \exp\left(-\frac{\|\mathsf{f}_j - \boldsymbol{Y}\|_2^2}{2\omega^2} \right) \pi_j \mathsf{f}_j}{\sum_{j=1}^M \exp\left(-\frac{\|\mathsf{f}_j - \boldsymbol{Y}\|_2^2}{2\omega^2} \right) \pi_j}. \tag{6}$$

This estimator is optimal in expectation (Dalalyan and Tsybakov, 2007, 2008), but suboptimal in deviation (Dai et al., 2012).

In this paper, we introduce the following *exponentiated least squares loss* motivated from the exponential moment technique for proving large deviation tail bounds for sums of random variables:

$$L(\boldsymbol{\psi}, \boldsymbol{\mu}) = \exp\left(\frac{1-\nu}{2\omega^2} \|\boldsymbol{\psi} - \boldsymbol{\mu}\|_2^2 \right) \ , \tag{7}$$

where the parameter $\nu \in (0, 1)$. It is easy to verify that the Bayes estimator defined by (5) with the loss function defined in (7) can be written as

$$\boldsymbol{\psi}_X(\omega^2, \nu) = \underset{\boldsymbol{\psi} \in \mathbb{R}^n}{\operatorname{argmin}} \, J(\boldsymbol{\psi}) \ , \tag{8}$$

where

$$J(\boldsymbol{\psi}) = \sum_{j=1}^M \pi_j \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2\omega^2} \|\mathsf{f}_j - \boldsymbol{Y}\|_2^2 + \frac{1-\nu}{2\omega^2} \|\boldsymbol{\psi} - \mathsf{f}_j\|_2^2 \right) \ . \tag{9}$$

The estimator $\boldsymbol{\psi}_X(\omega^2, \nu)$ will be referred to as the Bayesian model aggregation estimator with exponentiated least squares loss (BMAX).

To minimize $J(\boldsymbol{\psi})$, it is equivalent to minimize $\log J(\boldsymbol{\psi})$. Lemma 1 below shows the *strong convexity* and *smoothness* (under some conditions) of $\log J(\boldsymbol{\psi})$.

Given $\nu \in (0, 1)$ and $\omega > 0$, we define

$$A_1 = \frac{1-\nu}{\omega^2} \ , \tag{10}$$

moreover, if ℓ_2-norm of every f_j is bounded by a constant $L \in \mathbb{R}$:

$$\|\mathsf{f}_j\|_2 \le L \ , \ \ \forall \, j = 1, \ldots, M \ , \tag{11}$$

A_2 and A_3 are defined as

$$A_2 = \frac{1-\nu}{\omega^2} + \left(\frac{1-\nu}{\omega^2}\right)^2 L^2 \,, \tag{12}$$

$$A_3 = \left(\frac{1-\nu}{\omega^2}\right) L^2 + \left(\frac{1-\nu}{\omega^2}\right)^2 L^4 \,. \tag{13}$$

Lemma 1. *For any $\boldsymbol{\psi} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, define the Hessian matrix of $\log J(\boldsymbol{\psi})$ as $\nabla^2 \log J(\boldsymbol{\psi}) = \frac{\partial^2 \log J(\boldsymbol{\psi})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\psi} \partial \boldsymbol{\psi}^\top}$, then we have*

$$\nabla^2 \log J(\boldsymbol{\psi}) \geq A_1 \boldsymbol{I}_n \,. \tag{14}$$

If $\{\mathsf{f}_1, \ldots, \mathsf{f}_M\}$ satisfies condition (11), then

$$\nabla^2 \log J(\boldsymbol{\psi}) \leq A_2 \boldsymbol{I}_n \,, \tag{15}$$

where A_1 and A_2 are defined in (10) and (12).

4 Dual Representation and Q-aggregation

In this section, we will show that the *Q-aggregation* scheme of Dai et al. (2012) with the standard Kullback-Leibler entropy solves a dual representation of the BMAX formulation defined by (8) and (9).

Given $\boldsymbol{Y}$ and $\{\mathsf{f}_1, \ldots, \mathsf{f}_M\}$, Q-aggregation $\mathsf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}^Q}$ is defined as following:

$$\mathsf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}^Q} = \sum_{j=1}^M \lambda_j^Q \mathsf{f}_j \,, \tag{16}$$

where $\boldsymbol{\lambda}^Q = (\lambda_1^Q, \ldots, \lambda_M^Q)^\top \in \Lambda^M$ such that

$$\boldsymbol{\lambda}^Q \in \operatorname*{argmin}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda} \in \Lambda^M} Q(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) \,, \tag{17}$$

$$Q(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) = \|\mathsf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} - \boldsymbol{Y}\|_2^2 + \nu \sum_{j=1}^M \lambda_j \|\mathsf{f}_j - \mathsf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}\|_2^2 + 2\omega^2 \mathcal{K}_\rho(\boldsymbol{\lambda}, \boldsymbol{\pi}) \,, \tag{18}$$

for some $\nu \in (0,1)$, where the ρ-entropy $\mathcal{K}_\rho(\boldsymbol{\lambda}, \boldsymbol{\pi})$ is defined as

$$\mathcal{K}_\rho(\boldsymbol{\lambda}, \boldsymbol{\pi}) = \sum_{j=1}^M \lambda_j \log\left(\frac{\rho(\lambda_j)}{\pi_j}\right) \,, \tag{19}$$

where ρ is a real valued function on $[0,1]$ satisfying

$$\rho(t) \geq t \,, \quad t \log \rho(t) \text{ is convex} \,. \tag{20}$$

When $\rho(t) = t$, $\mathcal{K}_\rho(\boldsymbol{\lambda}, \boldsymbol{\pi})$ becomes $\mathcal{K}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}, \boldsymbol{\pi})$, the Kullback-Leibler entropy. When $\rho(t) = 1$, $\mathcal{K}_\rho(\boldsymbol{\lambda}, \boldsymbol{\pi}) = \sum_{j=1}^M \lambda_j \log(1/\pi_j)$, a linear entropy in Λ^M, and in particular the penalty $\mathcal{K}_\rho(\boldsymbol{\lambda}, \boldsymbol{\pi})$ in (18) becomes a constant when $\boldsymbol{\pi}$ is a flat prior.

To illustrate duality, we shall first introduce a function $T : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ as

$$T(\boldsymbol{h}) = -\frac{\nu}{1-\nu}\|\boldsymbol{h} - \boldsymbol{Y}\|_2^2 - 2\omega^2 \log\left(\sum_{j=1}^{M} \pi_j \exp\left(-\frac{\nu}{2\omega^2}\|\mathsf{f}_j - \boldsymbol{h}\|_2^2\right)\right) , \tag{21}$$

and denote the maximizer of $T(\boldsymbol{h})$ as

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{h}} = \underset{\boldsymbol{h}\in\mathbb{R}^n}{\operatorname{argmax}}\, T(\boldsymbol{h}) . \tag{22}$$

Define function $S : \Lambda^M \times \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ as

$$S(\boldsymbol{\lambda}, \boldsymbol{h}) = -\frac{\nu}{1-\nu}\|\boldsymbol{h} - \boldsymbol{Y}\|_2^2 + \nu\sum_{j=1}^{M} \lambda_j \|\mathsf{f}_j - \boldsymbol{h}\|_2^2 + 2\omega^2 \mathcal{K}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}, \boldsymbol{\pi}) . \tag{23}$$

It is not difficult to verify that for $\nu \in (0, 1)$, $S(\boldsymbol{\lambda}, \boldsymbol{h})$ is convex in $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ and concave in $\boldsymbol{h}$. The following duality lemma states the relationship between $\hat{\boldsymbol{h}}$ and $\mathsf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}^Q}$.

Lemma 2. *When $\rho(t) = t$, we have the following result*

$$Q(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) = \max_{\boldsymbol{h}\in\mathbb{R}^n} S(\boldsymbol{\lambda}, \boldsymbol{h}), \qquad T(\boldsymbol{h}) = \min_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}\in\Lambda^M} S(\boldsymbol{\lambda}, \boldsymbol{h}).$$

$$\min_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}\in\Lambda^M} Q(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) = \min_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}\in\Lambda^M} \max_{\boldsymbol{h}\in\mathbb{R}^n} S(\boldsymbol{\lambda}, \boldsymbol{h}) = \max_{\boldsymbol{h}\in\mathbb{R}^n} \min_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}\in\Lambda^M} S(\boldsymbol{\lambda}, \boldsymbol{h}) = \max_{\boldsymbol{h}\in\mathbb{R}^n} T(\boldsymbol{h}),$$

where the equality is achieved at $(\boldsymbol{\lambda}^Q, \hat{\boldsymbol{h}})$. Moreover, we have

$$\left\{(\boldsymbol{\lambda}^Q, \hat{\boldsymbol{h}})\right\} = A \cap B,$$

where A and B are two hyper-surfaces in $\Lambda^M \times \mathbb{R}^n$ defined as

$$\begin{aligned} A &= \left\{(\boldsymbol{\lambda}, \boldsymbol{h}) \in \Lambda^M \times \mathbb{R}^n : \boldsymbol{h} = \frac{1}{\nu}\boldsymbol{Y} - \frac{1-\nu}{\nu}\mathsf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}\right\} , \\ B &= \left\{(\boldsymbol{\lambda}, \boldsymbol{h}) \in \Lambda^M \times \mathbb{R}^n : \lambda_j = \frac{\exp\left(-\frac{\nu}{2\omega^2}\|\mathsf{f}_j - \boldsymbol{h}\|_2^2\right)\pi_j}{\sum_{i=1}^{M}\exp\left(-\frac{\nu}{2\omega^2}\|\mathsf{f}_i - \boldsymbol{h}\|_2^2\right)\pi_i}\right\} . \end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

Lemma 2 states that, $(\boldsymbol{\lambda}^Q, \hat{\boldsymbol{h}})$ is the only joint of hyper-surfaces A and B, and the saddle point of function $S(\boldsymbol{\lambda}, \boldsymbol{h})$ over space $\Lambda^M \times \mathbb{R}^n$.

With $T(\boldsymbol{h})$ defined as in (21), we can employ the transformation $\boldsymbol{h} = \frac{1}{\nu}\boldsymbol{Y} - \frac{1-\nu}{\nu}\boldsymbol{\psi}$, and it is easy to verify that

$$T(\boldsymbol{h}) = -2\omega^2 \log\left(J(\boldsymbol{\psi})\right) , \tag{25}$$

where $J(\boldsymbol{\psi})$ is defined in (9). Since $J(\boldsymbol{\psi})$ is strict convex, $T(\boldsymbol{h})$ is strictly concave and $\hat{\boldsymbol{h}}$ is unique.

It follows that maximizing $T(\boldsymbol{h})$ is equivalent to minimizing $J(\boldsymbol{\psi})$, and thus

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{h}} = \frac{1}{\nu}\boldsymbol{Y} - \frac{1-\nu}{\nu}\boldsymbol{\psi}_X(\omega^2, \nu) .$$

We can combine this representation with

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{h}} = \frac{1}{\nu}\boldsymbol{Y} - \frac{1-\nu}{\nu}\mathsf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}^Q}$$

from Lemma 2 to obtain $\boldsymbol{\psi}_X(\omega^2, \nu) = \mathsf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}^Q}$. Therefore we have the following relationship:

Theorem 1. *When* $\rho(t) = t$,

$$\boldsymbol{\psi}_X(\omega^2, \nu) = \mathsf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}^Q} \ ,$$

where $\boldsymbol{\psi}_X(\omega^2, \nu)$ *is defined by* (8) *and* (9), *and* $\mathsf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}^Q}$ *is defined by* (16),(17) *and* (18).

Theorem 1 states that, when $\rho(t) = t$, $\mathcal{K}_\rho(\boldsymbol{\lambda}, \boldsymbol{\pi})$ becomes the Kullback-Leibler entropy, and Q-aggregation with the Kullback-Leibler entropy leads to an estimator $\mathsf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}^Q}$ that is essentially a dual representation of the BMAX estimator $\boldsymbol{\psi}_X(\omega^2, \nu)$. It follows that, $\boldsymbol{\psi}_X(\omega^2, \nu)$ should share the same optimality (both in expectation and deviation) as $\mathsf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}^Q}$ in solving the model averaging problem (optimality of $\mathsf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}^Q}$ is shown in Theorem 3.1 of Dai et al. (2012) with more general $\mathcal{K}_\rho(\boldsymbol{\lambda}, \boldsymbol{\pi})$ where $\rho(t)$ only needs to satisfy the condition (20)).

However, unlike the primal objective function $J(\boldsymbol{\psi})$ which is defined on $\mathbb{R}^n$, the dual objective function $Q(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$ is defined on $\mathbb{R}^M$. When M is large or infinity, the optimization of $Q(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$ is non-trivial. Although greedy algorithms are proposed in (Dai et al., 2012), they cannot handle the standard KL-divergence; instead they can only work with the linear entropy where $\rho(t) = 1$; it gives a larger penalty than the standard KL-divergence (and thus worse resulting oracle inequality), and it cannot be generalized to handle continuous dictionaries (because in such case, the linear entropy with $\rho(t) = 1$ will always be $+\infty$). Therefore the numerical greedy procedures of (Dai et al., 2012) converges to a solution with a worse oracle bound than that of the solution for the primal formulation considered in this paper.

The following two corollaries (Corollary 1 and Corollary 2) are listed for illustration convenience, they are directly implied from Theorem 1 and optimality of $\mathsf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}^Q}$ in Theorem 3.1 of Dai et al. (2012).

Corollary 1. *Assume that* $\nu \in (0, 1)$ *and* $\omega^2 \geq \frac{\sigma^2}{\min(\nu, 1-\nu)}$. *For any* $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \in \Lambda^M$, *the following oracle inequality holds*

$$\|\boldsymbol{\psi}_X(\omega^2, \nu) - \boldsymbol{\eta}\|_2^2 \leq \nu \sum_{j=1}^M \lambda_j \|\mathsf{f}_j - \boldsymbol{\eta}\|_2^2 + (1-\nu) \|\mathsf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} - \boldsymbol{\eta}\|_2^2 + 2\omega^2 \mathcal{K}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}, \boldsymbol{\pi}\delta) \ , \tag{26}$$

with probability at least $1 - \delta$. *Moreover,*

$$\mathbb{E}\|\boldsymbol{\psi}_X(\omega^2, \nu) - \boldsymbol{\eta}\|_2^2 \leq \nu \sum_{j=1}^M \lambda_j \|\mathsf{f}_j - \boldsymbol{\eta}\|_2^2 + (1-\nu) \|\mathsf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} - \boldsymbol{\eta}\|_2^2 + 2\omega^2 \mathcal{K}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}, \boldsymbol{\pi}) \ . \tag{27}$$

Since $\nu \sum_{j=1}^M \lambda_j \|\mathsf{f}_j - \boldsymbol{\eta}\|_2^2 = \nu \sum_{j=1}^M \lambda_j \|\mathsf{f}_j - \mathsf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}\|_2^2 + \nu \|\mathsf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} - \boldsymbol{\eta}\|_2^2$, our theorem implies that $\boldsymbol{\psi}_X(\omega^2, \nu)$ can compete with an arbitrary $\mathsf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$ in the convex hull with $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \in \Lambda^M$ as long as the variance term $\nu \sum_{j=1}^M \lambda_j \|\mathsf{f}_j - \mathsf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}\|_2^2$ and the divergence term $K(\boldsymbol{\lambda}, \boldsymbol{\pi})$ are small.

Although for notation simplicity, the result is stated for finite dictionary $\mathcal{H}$, the analysis of the paper directly applies to infinite dictionaries where $M = \infty$ as well as continuous dictionaries. For example, given a matrix $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$, we may consider a continuous dictionary indexed by vector w as $\mathcal{H} = \{\mathsf{f}_w \in \mathbb{R}^n : \mathsf{f}_w = Xw \quad (w \in \mathbb{R}^d; \|w\|_2 \leq 1)\}$. We may consider the uniform prior $\boldsymbol{\pi}$ on w, and the corollary is well-defined as long as a distribution $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ on $w \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is concentrated around a single model (so that the variance term corresponding to $\int \lambda_w \|\mathsf{f}_w - \mathsf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}\|_2^2 dw$ is small) with finite KL divergence with respect to $\boldsymbol{\pi}$. For example, $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ can be chosen as the uniform distribution on a small ball $\{w : \|w - w_0\|_2 \leq r\}$. In such case, $\mathsf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} = \mathsf{f}_{w_0}$ and the variance term is small when r is small. Corollary 1 can be applied to derive an oracle inequality that competes with any single model f_{w_0}.

In the case that M is finite, we can more directly obtain an oracle inequality that competes with the best single model, which is the situation that $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ is at a vertex of the simplex Λ^M:

Corollary 2. *Under the assumptions of Corollary 1, $\boldsymbol{\psi}_X(\omega^2, \nu)$ satisfies*

$$\|\boldsymbol{\psi}_X(\omega^2,\nu) - \boldsymbol{\eta}\|_2^2 \leq \min_{j\in 1,\ldots,M} \left\{ \|\mathsf{f}_j - \boldsymbol{\eta}\|_2^2 + 2\omega^2 \log\left(\frac{1}{\pi_j \delta}\right) \right\} , \tag{28}$$

with probability at least $1-\delta$. Moreover,

$$\mathbb{E}\|\boldsymbol{\psi}_X(\omega^2,\nu) - \boldsymbol{\eta}\|_2^2 \leq \min_{j\in 1,\ldots,M} \left\{ \|\mathsf{f}_j - \boldsymbol{\eta}\|_2^2 + 2\omega^2 \log\left(\frac{1}{\pi_j}\right) \right\} . \tag{29}$$

It is also worth pointing out that the condition $\omega^2 \geq \frac{\sigma^2}{\min(\nu,1-\nu)}$ implies that ω^2 is at least greater than $2\sigma^2$ (when $\nu = 1/2$), and intuitively this inflation of noise allows the Bayes estimator to handle misspecification of the true mean η, which is not necessarily included in the candidate dictionary $\mathcal{H}$.

Finally we note that in the Bayesian framework stated in this section, when we change the underlying loss function $L(\boldsymbol{\psi}, \boldsymbol{\mu})$ from the standard least squares loss to the exponentiated least squares loss (7), Bayes estimator changes from EWMA which is optimal only in expectation to BMAX which is optimal both in expectation and in deviation. The difference is that the least squares loss only controls the bias, while the exponentiated least squares loss controls both bias and variance (as well as higher order moments) simultaneously. This can be seen by using Taylor expansion

$$\exp\left(\frac{1-\nu}{2\omega^2}\|\boldsymbol{\psi}-\boldsymbol{\mu}\|_2^2\right) = 1 + \frac{1-\nu}{2\omega^2}\|\boldsymbol{\psi}-\boldsymbol{\mu}\|_2^2 + (1/2)\left(\frac{1-\nu}{2\omega^2}\|\boldsymbol{\psi}-\boldsymbol{\mu}\|_2^2\right)^2 + \cdots .$$

Since deviation bounds require us to control high order moments, the exponentiated least squares loss is naturally suited for obtaining deviation bounds.

5 Greedy Model Averaging Algorithm (GMA-BMAX)

Strong convexity of $\log J(\boldsymbol{\psi})$ directly implies that the minimizer $\boldsymbol{\psi}_X(\omega^2, \nu)$ is unique. Moreover, it implies the following result which means that an estimator that approximately minimizes $\log J(\boldsymbol{\psi})$ satisfies an oracle inequality slightly worse than that of $\boldsymbol{\psi}_X(\omega^2, \nu)$ in Corollary 1. This result suggests that we can employ appropriate numerical procedures to approximately solve (8), and Corollary 1 implies an oracle inequality for such approximate solutions.

Proposition 1. *Let $\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}$ be an ϵ-approximate minimizer of $\log J(\boldsymbol{\psi})$ for some $\epsilon > 0$:*

$$\log J(\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}) \leq \min_{\boldsymbol{\psi}} \log J(\boldsymbol{\psi}) + \epsilon.$$

Then we have

$$\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}} - \boldsymbol{\eta}\|_2^2 \leq \|\boldsymbol{\psi}_X(\omega^2,\nu) - \boldsymbol{\eta}\|_2^2 + 2\sqrt{2\epsilon/A_1}\|\boldsymbol{\psi}_X(\omega^2,\nu) - \boldsymbol{\eta}\|_2 + \frac{2\epsilon}{A_1}.$$

Proof. The strong convexity of $\log J(\cdot)$ in (14) implies that

$$\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}} - \boldsymbol{\psi}_X(\omega^2, \nu)\|_2^2 \leq \frac{2}{A_1}\left(\log J(\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}) - \log J(\boldsymbol{\psi}_X(\omega^2, \nu))\right) \leq 2\epsilon/A_1.$$

Now plug the above inequality to the following equation

$$\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}} - \boldsymbol{\eta}\|_2^2 = \|\boldsymbol{\psi}_X(\omega^2, \nu) - \boldsymbol{\eta}\|_2^2 + 2\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}} - \boldsymbol{\psi}_X(\omega^2, \nu)\|_2\|\boldsymbol{\psi}_X(\omega^2, \nu) - \boldsymbol{\eta}\|_2 + \|\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}} - \boldsymbol{\psi}_X(\omega^2, \nu)\|_2^2,$$

we obtain the desired bound. □

The GMA-BMAX algorithm given in Algorithm 1 is a greedy algorithm that adds at most one function from the dictionary $\mathcal{H}$ at each iteration. This feature is attractive as it outputs a k-sparse solution that depends on at most k functions from the dictionary after k iterations. Similar algorithms for model averaging have appeared in Dai and Zhang (2011) and Dai et al. (2012).

Algorithm 1 Greedy Model Averaging Algorithm (GMA-BMAX)

Input: Noisy observation $\boldsymbol{Y}$, dictionary $\mathcal{H} = \{f_1, \ldots, f_M\}$, prior $\boldsymbol{\pi} \in \Lambda^M$, parameters ν, ω.
Output: Aggregate estimator $\boldsymbol{\psi}^{(k)}$.

Let $\boldsymbol{\psi}^{(0)} = 0$.
for $k = 1, 2, \ldots$ **do**
  Set $\alpha_k = \frac{2}{k+1}$
  $J^{(k)} = \operatorname{argmin}_j \log J(\boldsymbol{\psi}^{(k-1)} + \alpha_k(\mathsf{f}_j - \boldsymbol{\psi}^{(k-1)}))$
  $\boldsymbol{\psi}^{(k)} = \boldsymbol{\psi}^{(k-1)} + \alpha_k(\mathsf{f}_{J^{(k)}} - \boldsymbol{\psi}^{(k-1)})$
end for

The following proposition follows from the standard analysis in Frank and Wolfe (1956); Jones (1992); Barron (1993). It shows that the estimator $\boldsymbol{\psi}^{(k)}$ from Algorithm 1 converges to $\boldsymbol{\psi}_X(\omega^2, \nu)$.

Proposition 2. *For $\boldsymbol{\psi}^{(k)}$ as defined in Algorithm 1 (GMA-BMAX), if $\{\mathsf{f}_1, \ldots, \mathsf{f}_M\}$ satisfies condition* (11)*, then*

$$\log J(\boldsymbol{\psi}^{(k)}) \leq \log J(\boldsymbol{\psi}_X(\omega^2, \nu)) + \frac{8A_3}{k+3}\,. \tag{30}$$

Proposition 2 states that, after running algorithm GMA-BMAX for k steps to obtain $\boldsymbol{\psi}^{(k)}$, the corresponding objective value $\log J(\boldsymbol{\psi}^{(k)})$ converges to the optimal objective value $\log J(\boldsymbol{\psi}_X(\omega^2, \nu))$ at a rate $O(1/k)$. Combine this result with Proposition 1, we obtain the following oracle inequality, which shows that the regret of the estimator $\boldsymbol{\psi}^{(k)}$ after running k steps of GMA-BMAX converges to that of $\boldsymbol{\psi}_X(\omega^2, \nu)$ in Corollary 1 at a rate $O(1/\sqrt{k})$.

Corollary 3. *Assume $\nu \in (0, 1)$ and if $\omega^2 \geq \frac{\sigma^2}{\min(\nu, 1-\nu)}$. Consider $\boldsymbol{\psi}^{(k)}$ as in Algorithm 1 (GMA-BMAX). For any $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \in \Lambda^M$, the following oracle inequality holds*

$$\begin{aligned}\|\boldsymbol{\psi}^{(k)} - \boldsymbol{\eta}\|_2^2 \leq{}& \nu \sum_{j=1}^{M} \lambda_j \|\mathsf{f}_j - \boldsymbol{\eta}\|_2^2 + (1-\nu)\,\|\mathsf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} - \boldsymbol{\eta}\|_2^2 + 2\omega^2 \mathcal{K}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}, \boldsymbol{\pi}\delta) \\ &+ 2\sqrt{\frac{16A_3}{A_1(k+3)}}\|\boldsymbol{\psi}_X(\omega^2, \nu) - \boldsymbol{\eta}\|_2 + \frac{16A_3}{A_1(k+3)}\end{aligned} \tag{31}$$

with probability at least $1-\delta$. *Moreover,*

$$\mathbb{E}\|\boldsymbol{\psi}^{(k)}-\boldsymbol{\eta}\|_2^2 \le \nu\sum_{j=1}^{M}\lambda_j\|\mathsf{f}_j-\boldsymbol{\eta}\|_2^2+(1-\nu)\,\|\mathsf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}-\boldsymbol{\eta}\|_2^2+2\omega^2\mathcal{K}(\boldsymbol{\lambda},\boldsymbol{\pi}) + 2\sqrt{\frac{16A_3}{A_1(k+3)}}\mathbb{E}\|\boldsymbol{\psi}_X(\omega^2,\nu)-\boldsymbol{\eta}\|_2+\frac{16A_3}{A_1(k+3)}. \tag{32}$$

From Corollary 3, if $\omega^2 \ge \frac{\sigma^2}{\min(\nu,1-\nu)}$, for any $j=1,\ldots,M$ we have

$$\mathrm{MSE}(\psi^{(k)}) \le \mathrm{MSE}(f_j)+2\omega^2\log\left(\frac{1}{\pi_j\delta}\right)+O(1/\sqrt{k})$$

with probability at least $1-\delta$, and

$$\mathbb{E}\,\mathrm{MSE}(\psi^{(k)}) \le \mathrm{MSE}(f_j)+2\omega^2\log\left(\frac{1}{\pi_j}\right)+O(1/\sqrt{k})\ .$$

When $k\to\infty$, $\boldsymbol{\psi}^{(k)}$ achieves the optimal deviation bound. However, it does not imply optimal deviation bound for $\boldsymbol{\psi}^{(k)}$ with small k, while the greedy algorithms described in Dai and Zhang (2011) (GMA) and Dai et al. (2012) (GMA-0) achieve optimal deviation bounds for small k when $k\ge 2$. The advantage of GMA-BMAX is that the resulting estimator $\psi^{(k)}$ competes with any $\mathsf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$ with $\boldsymbol{\lambda}\in\Lambda^M$ under the KL entropy, and such a result can be applied even for infinity dictionaries containing functions indexed by continuous parameters, as long as the KL divergence $\mathcal{K}(\boldsymbol{\lambda},\boldsymbol{\pi})$ is well-defined (see relevant discussions in Section 3). On the other hand, the greedy estimators of Dai et al. (2012) for the Q-aggregation scheme can only deal with an upper bound of KL divergence referred to as linear entropy (see Section 4) that is not well-defined for continuous dictionaries. This means that GMA-BMAX is more generally applicable than the corresponding greedy algorithm GMA-0 in (Dai et al., 2012).

6 Experiments

Although the contribution of this work is mainly theoretical, we include some simulations to illustrate the performance of greedy model averaging algorithm GMA-BMAX proposed for the BMAX formulation. We focus on the average performance of different algorithms and configurations.

Set $n=50$ and $M=500$. We identify a function f with a vector $(f(x_1),\ldots,f(x_n))^\top\in\mathbb{R}^n$. Let $\boldsymbol{I}_n$ denote the identity matrix of $\mathbb{R}^n$ and let $\Theta\sim\mathcal{N}(0,\boldsymbol{I}_n)$ be a random vector, and define $\{\mathsf{f}_1,\ldots,\mathsf{f}_M\}$ as

$$\begin{cases}\mathsf{f}_j=\Theta+s\cdot\boldsymbol{\zeta}_j & \text{for } 1\le j\le M_1\ ,\\ \mathsf{f}_j=\boldsymbol{\zeta}_j & \text{for } M_1<j\le M\ ,\end{cases} \tag{33}$$

where $\boldsymbol{\zeta}_j\sim\mathcal{N}(0,\boldsymbol{I}_n)$ $(j=1,\ldots,M)$ are independent random vectors.

Let $\Delta\sim\mathcal{N}(0,\boldsymbol{I}_n)$ be a random vector. The regression function is defined by $\boldsymbol{\eta}=\mathsf{f}_1+0.5\Delta$. Note that typically f_1 will be the closest function to $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ but not necessarily. The noise vector $\boldsymbol{\xi}\sim\mathcal{N}(0,\sigma^2\boldsymbol{I}_n)$ is drawn independently of $\{\mathsf{f}_1,\ldots,\mathsf{f}_M\}$ where $\sigma=2$.

We define the oracle model (OM) f_{k^*}, where $k^* = \operatorname{argmin}_j \mathrm{MSE}(f_j)$. The model f_{k^*} is clearly not a valid estimator because it depends on the unobserved η, however it can be used as a performance benchmark. The performance difference between an estimator $\hat{\eta}$ and the oracle model f_{k^*} is measured by the *regret* defined as:

$$R(\hat{\eta}) = \mathrm{MSE}(\hat{\eta}) - \mathrm{MSE}(f_{k^*}) \; . \tag{34}$$

Since the target is $\boldsymbol{\eta} = \mathsf{f}_1 + 0.5\Delta$, and f_1 and Δ are random Gaussian vectors, the oracle model is likely f_1 (but it may not be f_1 due to the misspecification vector Δ). The noise $\sigma = 2$ is relatively large, which implies a situation where the best convex aggregation does not outperform the oracle model. This is the scenario we considered here. For simplicity, all algorithms use a flat prior $\pi_j = 1/M$ for all j. The experiment is performed with 100 replications.

One method we compare to is the STAR algorithm of Audibert (2008) which is optimal both in expectation and in deviation under the uniform prior. Mathematically, suppose f_{k_1} is the empirical risk minimizer among functions in $\mathcal{H}$, where

$$k_1 = \operatorname*{argmin}_j \widehat{\mathrm{MSE}}(f_j) \; , \tag{35}$$

the STAR estimator f^* is defined as

$$f^* = (1 - \alpha^*) f_{k_1} + \alpha^* f_{k_2} \; , \tag{36}$$

where

$$(\alpha^*, k_2) = \operatorname*{argmin}_{\alpha \in (0,1), j} \widehat{\mathrm{MSE}}\big((1-\alpha) f_{k_1} + \alpha f_j\big) \; . \tag{37}$$

Another natural solution to solve the model averaging problem is to take the vector of weights $\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{\mathrm{PROJ}}$ defined by

$$\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{\mathrm{PROJ}} \in \operatorname*{argmin}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda} \in \Lambda^M} \widehat{\mathrm{MSE}}(\mathsf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}) \; , \tag{38}$$

which minimizes the empirical risk. We call $\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{\mathrm{PROJ}}$ the vector of *projection weights* since the aggregate estimator $\mathsf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{\mathrm{PROJ}}}$ is the projection of $\boldsymbol{Y}$ onto the convex hull of the f_j's.

Q-aggregation (with Kullback-Leibler entropy when $\rho(t) = t$) is a dual representation of BMAX, which will be solved by greedy model averaging algorithm GMA-BMAX, while Q-aggregation (with linear entropy when $\rho(t) = 1$) can be solved by GMA-0 from Dai et al. (2012) (see Algorithm 2 below).

Algorithm 2 GMA-0 Algorithm

Input: Noisy observation $\boldsymbol{Y}$, dictionary $\mathcal{H} = \{f_1, \ldots, f_M\}$, prior $\boldsymbol{\pi} \in \Lambda^M$, parameters ν, β.
Output: Aggregate estimator $\mathsf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{(k)}}$.

Let $\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{(0)} = 0$, $\mathsf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{(0)}} = 0$.
for $k = 1, 2, \ldots$ **do**
  Set $\alpha_k = \frac{2}{k+1}$
  $J^{(k)} = \operatorname{argmin}_j Q(\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{(k-1)} + \alpha_k(\mathsf{e}^{(j)} - \boldsymbol{\lambda}^{(k-1)}))$
  $\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{(k)} = \boldsymbol{\lambda}^{(k-1)} + \alpha_k(\mathsf{e}^{(J^{(k)})} - \boldsymbol{\lambda}^{(k-1)})$
end for

Table 1: Performance Comparison ($s = 1$ and $M_1 = 50$)

STAR	**EWMA**	**PROJ**
0.398 ± 0.39	0.374 ± 0.57	0.416 ± 0.33

	$k = 1$	$k = 5$	$k = 15$	$k = 60$	$k = 100$	$k = 150$
GMA-BMAX	0.651 ± 0.82	0.447 ± 0.48	0.382 ± 0.42	0.327 ± 0.39	0.318 ± 0.39	0.314 ± 0.39
GMA-0	0.41 ± 0.78	0.308 ± 0.45	0.304 ± 0.41	0.303 ± 0.41	0.301 ± 0.4	0.302 ± 0.4

Table 2: Cumulative Frequency of Regret ($s = 1$, $M_1 = 50$ and $k = 150$)

Upper Boundary	0	0.3	0.6	0.9	1.2	1.5	1.8	2.1
GMA-BMAX	18	64	80	90	97	99	99	100
GMA-0	18	66	82	89	96	98	99	100
EWMA	48	66	75	79	86	93	97	100

We adopt flat priors $\pi = 1/M$ $(j = 1, \ldots, M)$ for simplicity. From the definition of $Q(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$ (18), it is easy to see that, the minimizer of $Q(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$ (when $\rho(t) = 1$ with flat prior) becomes $\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{\text{PROJ}}$ in (38) by setting $\nu = 0$, so $\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{\text{PROJ}}$ is approximated by GMA-0 with $\nu = 0$ and 200 iterations, and the projection algorithm is denoted by "PROJ". GMA-BMAX and GMA-0 are run for K iterations up to $K = 150$, with $\nu = 1/2$. Parameter ω for GMA-BMAX and exponential weighted model averaging (denoted by "EWMA") is tuned by 10-fold cross-validation. STAR estimator is also included. Regrets of all algorithms defined in (34) are reported for comparisons.

In the following, we consider two scenarios. The first situation is when the basis are not very correlated; in such case GMA-0 can perform better than GMA-BMAX because the former (which employs linear entropy) produces sparser estimators. The second situation is when the basis are highly correlated; in such case GMA-BMAX is superior to GMA-0 because the former (which employs strongly convex KL-entropy) gives the clustered basis functions similar weights while the latter tends to select one from the clustered basis functions which may lead to model selection error. The correlated basis situation occurs in the continuous dictionary setting.

6.1 Experiment 1: when $s = 1$ and $M_1 = 50$, basis are not very correlated

Table 1 is a comparison of commonly used estimators (STAR, EWMA and PROJ) with GMA-BMAX and GMA-0. The regrets are reported using the "mean $\pm$ standard deviation" format. Table 2 is the cumulative frequency table of GMA-BMAX, GMA-0 and EWMA with 100 replicates and fixed iteration k. For each entry, we summarize the number of replicates with regrets which are smaller than or equal to the upper boundary value.

The results in Table 1 indicate that GMA-0 has the best performance as iteration k increases, and GMA-0 outperforms STAR, EWMA and PROJ after as small as $k = 5$ iterations, which still gives a relatively sparse averaged model. This is consistent with Theorem 4.1 and 4.2 in Dai et al. (2012) which states that GMA-0 has optimal bounds for small k ($k \geq 2$).

GMA-BMAX prefers dense model putting similar weights on similar candidates. Specifically, GMA-BMAX is greedy algorithm with estimators converge to $\boldsymbol{\psi}_X(\omega^2, \nu)$, the aggregate by BMAX

as defined in (8). It is easy to verify that $\boldsymbol{\psi}_X(\omega^2, \nu) = \mathsf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$ with $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \in \Lambda^M$ defined as

$$\lambda_j \propto \pi_j \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2\omega^2}\|\mathsf{f}_j - \boldsymbol{Y}\|_2^2 + \frac{1-\nu}{2\omega^2}\|\boldsymbol{\psi}_X(\omega^2, \nu) - \mathsf{f}_j\|_2^2\right) ,$$

thus two similar candidates f_i and f_j will have similar weights.

In contrast, GMA-0 prefers sparse model by selecting candidate less related to estimator from previous iteration. Specifically, with flat prior $\boldsymbol{\pi}$ assumed, the choice of $J^{(k)}$ in GMA-0 algorithm can be further simplified to

$$J^{(k)} = \underset{j}{\operatorname{argmin}} \left\{\|\mathsf{f}_j - \boldsymbol{Y}\|_2^2 - (1-\nu)(1-\alpha_k)\|\mathsf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{(k-1)}} - \mathsf{f}_j\|_2^2\right\} , \tag{39}$$

thus at each iteration k in GMA-0 algorithm, estimator f_j is preferred if it has similar distance to $\boldsymbol{Y}$ yet being less correlated to current aggregate estimator $\mathsf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{(k-1)}}$ (because the minimization requires $\|\mathsf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{(k-1)}} - \mathsf{f}_j\|_2^2$ to be large while $\|\mathsf{f}_j - \boldsymbol{Y}\|_2^2$ being small).

In Experiment 1, the first 50 candidates $\{\mathsf{f}_1, \ldots, \mathsf{f}_M\}$ are closer to truth $\boldsymbol{\eta} = \mathsf{f}_1 + 0.5\Delta$ than other candidate f_j ($j > 50$), yet they are not very correlated when $s = 1$. Sparsity is preferred when correlations are not strong among predicting features (in our experiment, the first 50 candidates), and GMA-0 is to output sparser estimator than GMA-BMAX. Therefore, we would expect GMA-0 achieving smaller regret than GMA-BMAX in this situation.

Although GMA-BMAX is worse than GMA-0 when the basis are not very correlated, it beats EWMA, STAR and PROJ when iteration k is large enough.

Figure 1 compares the performance of GMA-BMAX, GMA-0 and EWMA. (a), (b) and (c) illustrate the histograms of regrets with 100 replicates. The corresponding cumulative frequencies are presented in Table 2. Since Corollary 3 indicates the optimal deviation bound is obtained by $k \to \infty$, we pick up $k = 150$ for GMA-BMAX and GMA-0 in order to make a fair comparison. As the histograms show, although EWMA has the most replicates which are close to zero, the distribution of EWMA estimator is the most dispersive with the most extreme values among these three methods. The performance is consistent with Dalalyan and Tsybakov (2007, 2008) and Dai et al. (2012) which state that EWMA estimator is optimal in expectation but sub-optimal in deviation. Therefore, we would expect GMA-BMAX and GMA-0 enjoy more concentrated distribution than EWMA because they are also optimal in deviation. (d) shows the convergence of GMA-BMAX and GMA-0. Note that GMA-BMAX and GMA-0 both initialize with $\boldsymbol{\psi}^{(0)} = 0$, but they produce difference estimators after the first iteration ($k = 1$), GMA-BMAX selects $j \in \{1, \ldots, M\}$ that minimizes $\log J(\mathsf{f}_j)$, whiles GMA-0 selects $j \in \{1, \ldots, M\}$ that minimizes $Q(\mathsf{f}_j)$ and the first stage output is actually the empirical risk minimizer f_{k_1} where $k_1 = \operatorname{argmin}_j \widehat{\mathrm{MSE}}(f_j)$. Moreover, since sparse model is preferred in this scenario, GMA-0 has smaller regret than GMA-BMAX, and they both converge fast with a few iterations.

6.2 Experiment 2: when $s = \sigma/\|\boldsymbol{\zeta}_j\|$ and $M_1 = M$, basis are all highly correlated

In Experiment 2, we define regression function as $\boldsymbol{\eta} = \Theta + 0.5\Delta$ which is slightly different from Experiment 1. The results in Table 3 indicate that GMA-BMAX perform better than GMA-0 as iteration k increases, and GMA-BMAX also beats STAR, PROJ and EWMA when k is large enough. Table 4 summarizes the cumulative frequency table for each method, and demonstrates that GMA-BMAX has most concentrated distribution.

In Experiment 2, all of the candidates $\{\mathsf{f}_1, \ldots, \mathsf{f}_M\}$ are closer to truth $\boldsymbol{\eta} = \Theta + 0.5\Delta$, and they are very correlated when s is small. GMA-BMAX tends to put similar weights on similar candidates,



Figure 1: (a)-(c) show the histograms of regrets for GMA-BMAX, GMA-0 and EWMA with $k = 150$; (d) reports the performance by plotting regrets $R(\boldsymbol{\psi}^{(k)})$ versus iterations k for case $s = 1$ and $M_1 = 50$.

while GMA-0 tends exclude other correlated candidates once one is selected, thus GMA-BMAX will average over those candidates with similar weights with resulting less variance (also less bias due to the design), while GMA-0 will have high variance due to selecting only one. Moreover, similar as GMA-BMAX, EWMA also prefer dense model by putting similar weights on similar candidates. However, EWMA estimator is a weighted average of all candidates with weights defined as

$$\lambda_j \propto \pi_j \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2\omega^2}\|\mathsf{f}_j - \boldsymbol{Y}\|_2^2\right) ,$$

and the weights of GMA-BMAX estimator is

$$\lambda_j \propto \pi_j \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2\omega^2}\|\mathsf{f}_j - \boldsymbol{Y}\|_2^2 + \frac{1-\nu}{2\omega^2}\|\boldsymbol{\psi}_X(\omega^2,\nu) - \mathsf{f}_j\|_2^2\right) ,$$

where $\boldsymbol{\psi}_X(\omega^2,\nu) = \mathsf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$ with $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \in \Lambda^M$.

Notice that, for all j, $\|\mathsf{f}_j - \boldsymbol{Y}\|_2^2$ are roughly equal to each other under this scenario. In other words, EWMA estimator becomes the average of all candidates while the GMA-BMAX estimator is still a weighed average of all basis, and the weights are adjusted by the extra term $\|\boldsymbol{\psi}_X(\omega^2,\nu) - \mathsf{f}_j\|_2^2$. Therefore, we would hope GMA-BMAX has smaller variances than EWMA.

Figure 2 compares the performance of GMA-BMAX, GMA-0 and EWMA. (a), (b) and (c) summarize the histograms of regrets, and the corresponding cumulative frequencies are represented

Table 3: Performance Comparison($s = \sigma/\|\boldsymbol{\zeta}_j\|$ and $M_1 = M$)

STAR	**EWMA**	**PROJ**
0.0528 ± 0.032	0.0458 ± 0.036	0.0441 ± 0.033

	$k=1$	$k=5$	$k=15$	$k=60$	$k=100$	$k=150$
GMA-BMAX	0.0923 ± 0.04	0.0438 ± 0.032	0.0369 ± 0.026	0.0354 ± 0.025	0.0353 ± 0.026	0.0354 ± 0.025
GMA-0	0.0871 ± 0.04	0.0605 ± 0.037	0.057 ± 0.036	0.0563 ± 0.035	0.0564 ± 0.035	0.0563 ± 0.035

Table 4: Cumulative Frequency of Regret ($s = \sigma/\|\boldsymbol{\zeta}_j\|$, $M_1 = M$ and $k = 150$)

Upper Boundary	0	0.031	0.063	0.094	0.126	0.157	0.189	0.220
GMA-BMAX	5	49	92	96	99	99	100	100
GMA-0	2	24	61	88	97	99	99	100
EWMA	2	41	78	92	97	99	99	100

in Table 4. Obviously, GMA-BMAX has the most concentrated result which is because GMA-BMAX is optimal both in expectation and in deviation while EWMA is optimal only in expectation. (d) illustrates the convergence of GMA-BMAX and GMA-0. Both methods converge within a few iterations, and GMA-BMAX achieves lower regret than GMA-0 when basis functions are clustered.

7 Conclusion

This paper introduces a new formulation for deviation optimal model averaging which we refer to as BMAX. It is motivated by Bayesian theoretical considerations with an appropriately defined exponentiated least squares loss. Moreover we established a primal-dual relationship of this estimator and the Q-aggregation scheme (with KL entropy) by Dai et al. (2012). This relationship not only establishes a natural Bayesian interpretation for Q-aggregation but also leads to new numerical algorithms for model aggregation that are suitable for the continuous dictionary setting where some basis functions are highly correlated. The new formulation and its relationship to Q-aggregation provides deeper understanding of deviation optimal model averaging procedures.

A Proofs

A.1 Proof of Lemma 1

Define $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \in \Lambda^M$ as

$$\lambda_j \propto \pi_j \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2\omega^2}\|\mathsf{f}_j - \boldsymbol{Y}\|_2^2 + \frac{1-\nu}{2\omega^2}\|\boldsymbol{\psi} - \mathsf{f}_j\|_2^2\right)$$

It follows that

$$\frac{\nabla J(\boldsymbol{\psi})}{J(\boldsymbol{\psi})} = \frac{1-\nu}{\omega^2}(\boldsymbol{\psi} - \mathsf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}})$$



Figure 2: (a)-(c) show the histograms of regrets for GMA-BMAX, GMA-0 and EWMA with $k = 150$; (d) reports the performance by plotting regrets $R(\boldsymbol{\psi}^{(k)})$ versus iterations k for case $s = \sigma/\|\boldsymbol{\zeta}_j\|$ and $M_1 = M$.

and

$$\frac{\nabla^2 J(\boldsymbol{\psi})}{J(\boldsymbol{\psi})} = \sum_{j=1}^{M} \lambda_j \left(\left(\frac{1-\nu}{\omega^2} \right)^2 (\boldsymbol{\psi} - \mathsf{f}_j)(\boldsymbol{\psi} - \mathsf{f}_j)^\top + \left(\frac{1-\nu}{\omega^2} \right) \boldsymbol{I}_n \right).$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\nabla^2 \log J(\boldsymbol{\psi}) &= \frac{(\nabla^2 J(\boldsymbol{\psi}))J(\boldsymbol{\psi}) - (\nabla J(\boldsymbol{\psi}))(\nabla J(\boldsymbol{\psi}))^\top}{J^2(\boldsymbol{\psi})} \\
&= \sum_{j=1}^{M} \lambda_j \left(\left(\frac{1-\nu}{\omega^2} \right)^2 (\boldsymbol{\psi} - \mathsf{f}_j)(\boldsymbol{\psi} - \mathsf{f}_j)^\top + \left(\frac{1-\nu}{\omega^2} \right) \boldsymbol{I}_n \right) \\
&\quad - \left(\frac{1-\nu}{\omega^2} \right)^2 (\boldsymbol{\psi} - \mathsf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}})(\boldsymbol{\psi} - \mathsf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}})^\top \\
&= \left(\frac{1-\nu}{\omega^2} \right) \boldsymbol{I}_n + \sum_{j=1}^{M} \lambda_j \left(\frac{1-\nu}{\omega^2} \right)^2 (\mathsf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} - \mathsf{f}_j)(\mathsf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} - \mathsf{f}_j)^\top.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore $\nabla^2 \log J(\boldsymbol{\psi}) \geq \left(\frac{1-\nu}{\omega^2} \right) \boldsymbol{I}_n$.

With the assumption that $\|\mathsf{f}_j\|_2 \le L$ for all j, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{j=1}^{M} \lambda_j (\mathsf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} - \mathsf{f}_j)(\mathsf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} - \mathsf{f}_j)^\top = \sum_{j=1}^{M} \lambda_j \mathsf{f}_j \mathsf{f}_j^\top - \mathsf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} \mathsf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^\top \\ \le & \sum_{j=1}^{M} \lambda_j \mathsf{f}_j \mathsf{f}_j^\top \le \sum_{j=1}^{M} \lambda_j L^2 \boldsymbol{I}_n = L^2 \boldsymbol{I}_n. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that $\nabla^2 \log J(\boldsymbol{\psi}) \le \left(\left(\frac{1-\nu}{\omega^2}\right) + \left(\frac{1-\nu}{\omega^2}\right)^2 L^2 \right) \boldsymbol{I}_n$.

A.2 Proof of Lemma 2

Proposition 3. *For any $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \in \Lambda^M$, real numbers $\{x_j\}_{j=1}^M$, and a constant $a > 0$, we have*

$$\sum_{j=1}^{M} \lambda_j x_j - a\mathcal{K}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}, \boldsymbol{\pi}) \le a \log \left(\sum_{j=1}^{M} \pi_j e^{x_j/a} \right) ,$$

and equation is obtained when $(x_j/a) - \log(\lambda_j/\pi_j) = const.$ over $1 \le j \le M$.

Proof. The result follows directly from Jensen's Inequality as

$$\exp\left(\sum_{j=1}^{M} \lambda_j ((x_j/a) - \log(\lambda_j/\pi_j)) \right) \le \sum_{j=1}^{M} \lambda_j \exp\left((x_j/a) - \log(\lambda_j/\pi_j)\right) = \sum_{j=1}^{M} \pi_j e^{x_j/a}.$$

□

Now by setting $x_j = -\nu \|\mathsf{f}_j - \boldsymbol{h}\|_2^2$ and $a = 2\omega^2$ in Proposition 3, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \min_{\boldsymbol{\lambda} \in \Lambda^M} \left(\nu \sum_{j=1}^{M} \lambda_j \|\mathsf{f}_j - \boldsymbol{h}\|_2^2 + 2\omega^2 \mathcal{K}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}, \boldsymbol{\pi}) \right) - \frac{\nu}{1-\nu} \|\boldsymbol{h} - \boldsymbol{Y}\|_2^2 \\ = & -\frac{\nu}{1-\nu} \|\boldsymbol{h} - \boldsymbol{Y}\|_2^2 - 2\omega^2 \log \left(\sum_{j=1}^{M} \pi_j e^{-\nu \|\mathsf{f}_j - \boldsymbol{h}\|_2^2 / 2\omega^2} \right), \end{aligned}$$

which implies that

$$T(\boldsymbol{h}) = \min_{\boldsymbol{\lambda} \in \Lambda^M} S(\boldsymbol{\lambda}, \boldsymbol{h}).$$

In addition, it is easy to verify that

$$Q(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) = \max_{\boldsymbol{h} \in \mathbb{R}^n} S(\boldsymbol{\lambda}, \boldsymbol{h}),$$

where the minimum is achieved at $\boldsymbol{h} = \mathsf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$.

Now let $\hat{\boldsymbol{h}}$ be the maximizer of $T(\boldsymbol{h})$ in (21), then by setting the derivative of (21) to zero, it is easy to observe that there exists a corresponding $\hat{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$ so that $(\hat{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}, \hat{\boldsymbol{h}}) \in A \cap B$. This means that $A \cap B \neq \emptyset$.

Now consider any $(\boldsymbol{\lambda}^0, \boldsymbol{h}^0) \in A \cap B$. We have

$$Q(\boldsymbol{\lambda}^0) \geq \min_{\boldsymbol{\lambda} \in \Lambda^M} Q(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) = \min_{\boldsymbol{\lambda} \in \Lambda^M} \max_{\boldsymbol{h} \in \mathbb{R}^n} S(\boldsymbol{\lambda}, \boldsymbol{h}) \geq \max_{\boldsymbol{h} \in \mathbb{R}^n} \min_{\boldsymbol{\lambda} \in \Lambda^M} S(\boldsymbol{\lambda}, \boldsymbol{h}).$$

The third inequality is the well-known weak duality (e.g., Lemma 36.1 in Rockafellar (1997)).

Also we have

$$\max_{\boldsymbol{h} \in \mathbb{R}^n} \min_{\boldsymbol{\lambda} \in \Lambda^M} S(\boldsymbol{\lambda}, \boldsymbol{h}) = \max_{\boldsymbol{h} \in \mathbb{R}^n} T(\boldsymbol{h}) = T(\hat{\boldsymbol{h}}) \geq T(\boldsymbol{h}^0) \ .$$

We thus have

$$Q(\boldsymbol{\lambda}^0) \geq \min_{\boldsymbol{\lambda} \in \Lambda^M} Q(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) = \min_{\boldsymbol{\lambda} \in \Lambda^M} \max_{\boldsymbol{h} \in \mathbb{R}^n} S(\boldsymbol{\lambda}, \boldsymbol{h}) \geq \max_{\boldsymbol{h} \in \mathbb{R}^n} \min_{\boldsymbol{\lambda} \in \Lambda^M} S(\boldsymbol{\lambda}, \boldsymbol{h}) = \max_{\boldsymbol{h} \in \mathbb{R}^n} T(\boldsymbol{h}) \geq T(\boldsymbol{h}^0).$$

Our target is now to prove $Q(\boldsymbol{\lambda}^0) = T(\boldsymbol{h}^0)$. Since $(\boldsymbol{\lambda}^0, \boldsymbol{h}^0) \in A \cap B$ we have

$$\begin{cases} \boldsymbol{h}^0 = \dfrac{1}{\nu}\boldsymbol{Y} - \dfrac{1-\nu}{\nu}\mathsf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}^0}, \\ \lambda_j^0 = \dfrac{\exp\left(-\frac{\nu}{2\omega^2}\|\mathsf{f}_j - \boldsymbol{h}^0\|_2^2\right)\pi_j}{\sum_{i=1}^M \exp\left(-\frac{\nu}{2\omega^2}\|\mathsf{f}_i - \boldsymbol{h}^0\|_2^2\right)\pi_i}. \end{cases}$$

It follows that for all j:

$$\sum_{i=1}^M \exp\left(-\frac{\nu}{2\omega^2}\|\mathsf{f}_i - \boldsymbol{h}^0\|_2^2\right)\pi_i = \frac{\exp\left(-\frac{\nu}{2\omega^2}\|\mathsf{f}_j - \boldsymbol{h}^0\|_2^2\right)\pi_j}{\lambda_j^0},$$

which implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \log\left(\sum_{i=1}^M \exp\left(-\frac{\nu}{2\omega^2}\|\mathsf{f}_i - \boldsymbol{h}^0\|_2^2\right)\pi_i\right) &= -\frac{\nu}{2\omega^2}\|\mathsf{f}_j - \boldsymbol{h}^0\|_2^2 - \log(\lambda_j^0/\pi_j) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^M \lambda_i^0\left(-\frac{\nu}{2\omega^2}\|\mathsf{f}_i - \boldsymbol{h}^0\|_2^2 - \log(\lambda_i^0/\pi_i)\right) \ , \end{aligned}$$

where the second equation is from summing up two sides of the first equation with weight λ_i^0 over $i = 1, \ldots, M$.

Plug back into $T(\boldsymbol{h}^0)$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} T(\boldsymbol{h}^0) &= -\frac{\nu}{1-\nu}\|\boldsymbol{h}^0 - \boldsymbol{Y}\|_2^2 - 2\omega^2\left[\sum_{i=1}^M \lambda_i^0\left(-\frac{\nu}{2\omega^2}\|\mathsf{f}_i - \boldsymbol{h}^0\|_2^2 - \log(\lambda_i^0/\pi_i)\right)\right] \\ &= -\frac{\nu}{1-\nu}\|\boldsymbol{h}^0 - \boldsymbol{Y}\|_2^2 + \nu\sum_{i=1}^M \lambda_i^0\|\mathsf{f}_i - \boldsymbol{h}^0\|_2^2 + 2\omega^2\mathcal{K}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}^0, \boldsymbol{\pi}) \\ &= \|\mathsf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}^0} - \boldsymbol{Y}\|_2^2 + \nu\sum_{i=1}^M \lambda_i^0\|\mathsf{f}_i - \mathsf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}^0}\|_2^2 + 2\omega^2\mathcal{K}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}^0, \boldsymbol{\pi}) \\ &= Q(\boldsymbol{\lambda}^0) \ , \end{aligned}$$

where the third equality is obtained by plugging in $\boldsymbol{h}^0 = \frac{1}{\nu}\boldsymbol{Y} - \frac{1-\nu}{\nu}\mathsf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}^0}$.

Therefore

$$Q(\boldsymbol{\lambda}^0) = \min_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}\in\Lambda^M} Q(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) = \min_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}\in\Lambda^M} \max_{\boldsymbol{h}\in\mathbb{R}^n} S(\boldsymbol{\lambda},\boldsymbol{h}) = \max_{\boldsymbol{h}\in\mathbb{R}^n} \min_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}\in\Lambda^M} S(\boldsymbol{\lambda},\boldsymbol{h}) = \max_{\boldsymbol{h}\in\mathbb{R}^n} T(\boldsymbol{h}) = T(\boldsymbol{h}^0).$$

Since $Q(\cdot)$ is strictly convex and $T(\cdot)$ is strictly concave, we have $\boldsymbol{h}^0 = \hat{\boldsymbol{h}}$ is the unique solution of $\max_{\boldsymbol{h}} T(\boldsymbol{h})$, and $\boldsymbol{\lambda}^0 = \boldsymbol{\lambda}$ is the unique solution of $\min_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} Q(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$. Using $\boldsymbol{h}^0 = \frac{1}{\nu}\boldsymbol{Y} - \frac{1-\nu}{\nu}\mathsf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}^0}$, we have

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{h}} = \frac{1}{\nu}\boldsymbol{Y} - \frac{1-\nu}{\nu}\mathsf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}^Q}.$$

This proves that $A \cap B$ contains the unique point $(\boldsymbol{\lambda}^Q, \hat{\boldsymbol{h}})$. ∎

A.3 Proof of Proposition 2

From definition, $\boldsymbol{\psi}_X(\omega^2,\nu) = \mathsf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$ with $\boldsymbol{\lambda}\in\Lambda^M$ defined as

$$\lambda_j \propto \pi_j \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2\omega^2}\|\mathsf{f}_j - \boldsymbol{Y}\|_2^2 + \frac{1-\nu}{2\omega^2}\|\boldsymbol{\psi}_X(\omega^2,\nu) - \mathsf{f}_j\|_2^2\right).$$

For any $j = 1,\ldots,M$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \log J(\boldsymbol{\psi}^{(k)}) = \log J\left(\boldsymbol{\psi}^{(k-1)} + \alpha_k(\mathsf{f}_{J^{(k)}} - \boldsymbol{\psi}^{(k-1)})\right) \\
\leq\ & \log J\left(\boldsymbol{\psi}^{(k-1)} + \alpha_k(\mathsf{f}_j - \boldsymbol{\psi}^{(k-1)})\right) \\
\leq\ & \log J(\boldsymbol{\psi}^{(k-1)}) + \alpha_k(\mathsf{f}_j - \boldsymbol{\psi}^{(k-1)})^\top \frac{\nabla J(\boldsymbol{\psi}^{(k-1)})}{J(\boldsymbol{\psi}^{(k-1)})} + 2\alpha_k^2 A_3,
\end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality comes from definition, the second inequality is from Taylor expansion at $\boldsymbol{\psi}^{(k-1)}$ and (15) in Lemma 1 with the fact that $\|\mathsf{f}_j - \boldsymbol{\psi}^{(k-1)}\|_2^2 \leq 4L^2$.

We multiply the above inequality by λ_j and sum over j to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\log J(\boldsymbol{\psi}^{(k)}) &\leq \log J(\boldsymbol{\psi}^{(k-1)}) + \alpha_k \sum_{j=1}^M \lambda_j(\mathsf{f}_j - \boldsymbol{\psi}^{(k-1)})^\top \frac{\nabla J(\boldsymbol{\psi}^{(k-1)})}{J(\boldsymbol{\psi}^{(k-1)})} + 2\alpha_k^2 A_3 \\
&= \log J(\boldsymbol{\psi}^{(k-1)}) + \alpha_k(\boldsymbol{\psi}_X(\omega^2,\nu) - \boldsymbol{\psi}^{(k-1)})^\top \frac{\nabla J(\boldsymbol{\psi}^{(k-1)})}{J(\boldsymbol{\psi}^{(k-1)})} + 2\alpha_k^2 A_3 \\
&\leq \log J(\boldsymbol{\psi}^{(k-1)}) + \alpha_k(\log J(\boldsymbol{\psi}_X(\omega^2,\nu)) - \log J(\boldsymbol{\psi}^{(k-1)})) + 2\alpha_k^2 A_3,
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from the convexity of $\log J(\boldsymbol{\psi})$.

Denote by $\delta_k = \log J(\boldsymbol{\psi}^{(k)}) - \log J(\boldsymbol{\psi}_X(\omega^2,\nu))$, it follows that

$$\delta_k \leq (1-\alpha_k)\delta_{k-1} + 2\alpha_k^2 A_3.$$

We now bound δ_0. Note that if we let $\mu_j \propto \pi_j \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2\omega^2}\|\mathsf{f}_j - \boldsymbol{Y}\|_2^2\right)$ such that $\sum_{j=1}^M \mu_j = 1$,

then

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta_0 &= \log J(\boldsymbol{\psi}^{(0)}) - \log J(\boldsymbol{\psi}_X(\omega^2,\nu)) \\
&= \log \sum_j \mu_j \exp\left(\frac{1-\nu}{2\omega^2}\|\boldsymbol{\psi}^{(0)} - \mathsf{f}_j\|_2^2\right) - \log \sum_j \mu_j \exp\left(\frac{1-\nu}{2\omega^2}\|\boldsymbol{\psi}_X(\omega^2,\nu) - \mathsf{f}_j\|_2^2\right) \\
&\leq \log\left(\sum_{j=1}^M \mu_j \exp\left(\frac{1-\nu}{2\omega^2}\|\boldsymbol{\psi}^{(0)} - \mathsf{f}_j\|_2^2\right)\right) \\
&\leq \frac{1-\nu}{2\omega^2}L^2 \leq 2A_3. \qquad (40)
\end{aligned}$$

The claim thus hold for δ_0. By mathematical induction, if $\delta_{k-1} \leq \frac{8A_3}{k+2}$ then

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta_k &\leq (1-\alpha_k)\delta_{k-1} + 2\alpha_k^2 A_3 \\
&\leq (1-2/(k+1))\frac{8A_3}{k+2} + 2(2/(k+1))^2 A_3 \leq \frac{8A_3}{k+3}.
\end{aligned}$$

This proves the desired bound. ∎

References

Audibert, J.-Y. (2008). Progressive mixture rules are deviation suboptimal. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 20* (J. Platt, D. Koller, Y. Singer and S. Roweis, eds.). MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, 41–48.

Barron, A. R. (1993). Universal approximation bounds for superposition of a sigmoidal function. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, **39** 930–945.

Dai, D., Rigollet, P. and Zhang, T. (2012). Deviation optimal learning using greedy q-aggregation. *Ann. Statist.*, **40** 1878–1905.

Dai, D. and Zhang, T. (2011). Greedy model averaging. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 24* (J. Shawe-Taylor, R. Zemel, P. Bartlett, F. Pereira and K. Weinberger, eds.). 1242–1250.

Dalalyan, A. and Tsybakov, A. (2008). Aggregation by exponential weighting, sharp pac-bayesian bounds and sparsity. *Machine Learning*, **72** 39–61.

Dalalyan, A. S. and Tsybakov, A. B. (2007). Aggregation by exponential weighting and sharp oracle inequalities. In *Learning theory*, vol. 4539 of *Lecture Notes in Comput. Sci.* Springer, Berlin, 97–111.

Frank, M. and Wolfe, P. (1956). An algorithm for quadratic programming. *Naval Res. Logist. Quart.*, **3** 95–110.

Gaïffas, S. and Lecué, G. (2011). Hyper-sparse optimal aggregation. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, **12** 1813–1833.

Jones, L. (1992). A simple lemma on greedy approximation in Hilbert space and convergence rates for projection pursuit regression and neural network training. *Ann. Statist.*, **20** 608–613.

Lecué, G. and Mendelson, S. (2009). Aggregation via empirical risk minimization. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, **145** 591–613. URL `http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00440-008-0180-8`.

Rigollet, P. (2012). Kullback–leibler aggregation and misspecified generalized linear models. *Ann. Statist.*, **40** 639–665.

Rigollet, P. and Tsybakov, A. (2012). Sparse estimation by exponential weighting. *Statistical Science (to appear). arXiv:1108.5116*.

Rockafellar, R. T. (1997). *Convex Analysis*. Princeton Landmarks.

Tsybakov, A. B. (2003). Optimal rates of aggregation. In *COLT* (B. Schölkopf and M. K. Warmuth, eds.), vol. 2777 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*. Springer, 303–313.